

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-13, and 18-40, as amended, and new claims 41-43 are pending in this application. In this Response, Applicant has amended certain claims. In light of the Office Action, Applicant believes these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, and are desirable for clarification purposes, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents.

In particular, independent claims 28 and 37 has been rewritten to include features previously recited in claim 40. In addition, claims 38-40 have been canceled. Furthermore, claim 36 has been rewritten to correct a minor typographical error. As no new matter has been added, Applicant respectfully requests entry of these amendments at this time.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant appreciates Examiner's allowance of claims 1-10, 12-13, and 18-27. In addition, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's recognition of allowable subject matter in claim 40 if rewritten in independent form. In response, claim 37 has been rewritten to include the features of claim 40 and any intervening features previously recited in claims 38-39.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 28-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0173367 to Gobush ("Gobush '367") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0032970 to Kiraly for the reasons provided on pages 2-5 of the Office Action. In addition, claim 33 was rejected under § 103(a) as obvious over Gobush '367 in view of Kiraly and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,471,383 to Gobush (Gobush '383) as explained on page 5. The Examiner also rejected claims 34 and 36 under § 103(a) as obvious over Gobush '367 in view of Kiraly and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0155896 to Gobush (Gobush '896) as provided on page 6 of the Office Action. Finally, claim 39 was rejected under § 103(a) as obvious over Gobush '367 in view of Kiraly and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,575,719 to Gobush (Gobush '719) as explained on pages 6-7.

As a threshold matter, it is not clear which claims actually stand rejected based on the combination of Gobush '367 and Kiraly. For example, claims 28-32 are stated to be rejected in the summary paragraph on page 2. Nevertheless, claims 37 and 38 are mentioned in the detailed

description of the rejection. *See, e.g.,* Page 2 and Page 5. Moreover, claim 35 is not mentioned in the rejection based on Gobush '367 and Kiraly or any of the remaining rejections, but the Office Action Summary notes that claims 28-39 are rejected. In light of the confusion, Applicant respectfully requests clarification as to the status of claim 35, *i.e.*, allowed or rejected, prior to this response.

Applicant maintains the remarks filed on October 9, 2007 with regard to the rejections in the Office Action and the references cited to support to the rejections. In the interest of expediting allowance of the application, however, Applicant has elected to rewrite claim 28 to feature the accuracy of the impact location determination within 0.1 inch, which the Examiner appears to recognize is allowable. In fact, the Examiner explains that the prior art does not disclose or suggest an image analyzer for determining golf ball impact location with accuracy within 0.1 inch.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that no combination of the cited references render obvious the present invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections based thereon is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present remarks still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fee to Hanify & King, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-4545, Order No. 20002.0313.

Respectfully submitted,
HANIFY & KING
Professional Corporation

Dated: April 23, 2008

By: Stephanie D. Scruggs
Stephanie D. Scruggs, Registration No. 54,432
HANIFY & KING
Professional Corporation
1875 K Street, N.W., Suite 707
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 719-1084 Telephone
(202) 719-1090 Facsimile